



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/648,414  | 08/26/2003  | Russell S. Neville   | 1776-0035           | 4003             |
| 7590  | 06/21/2007  |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| Maginot, Moore & Beck LLP<br>Chase Tower<br>111 Monument Circle , Suite 3250<br>Indianapolis, IN 46204-5109 |             |                      | POLLACK, MELVIN H   |                  |
|   |             | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
|   |             |                      | 2145                |                  |
|   |             | MAIL DATE            | DELIVERY MODE       |                  |
|   |             | 06/21/2007           | PAPER               |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                               |                     |  |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b>        | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                              | 10/648,414                    | NEVILLE ET AL.      |  |
|                              | Examiner<br>Melvin H. Pollack | Art Unit<br>2145    |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/26/03.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: see attached office action.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement filed 26 August 2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 7 recites the limitation "said redirect web pages" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 1 does not mention a redirection of web pages.

5. Claim 18 is rejected for similar reasons.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Assauchi (7,013,410) in view of Skanning et al. (6,879,973).
8. Assauchi teaches a method and system (abstract) of remotely diagnosing a printer (col. 1, line 1 – col. 4, line 45; col. 17, lines 1-60), wherein device functionality information is provided to the server (col. 5, lines 5-30). The server analyzes the information (col. 7, lines 1-45) and then, using a knowledge base, begins to automatically ask questions of the system for which the system automatically responds (col. 7, line 45 – col. 9, line 55) to which a solution is generated (col. 11, line 55 – col. 13, line 5).
9. Assauchi teaches that the client has a browser (Fig. 1, #20), but does not expressly disclose that the communication occurs through the browser. Assauchi also teaches that a hardware repair method may be suggested (col. 12, lines 19-20), but does not expressly disclose a suggestion to replace a component. Skanning teaches a method and system (abstract) of performing automated diagnoses of printer systems (col. 1, line 1 – col. 7, line 45) using a rules-based diagnostic database (col. 7, line 45 – col. 8, line 60) and a web browser (col. 8, line 60 – col. 9, line 20), wherein the solution may be determined as replacement of a component (col. 13, lines 55-67). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the inventions in order to lower expenses (col. 1, lines 15-20).
10. Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Assauchi and Skanning as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Webb et al. (5,727,135).

Art Unit: 2145

11. Asauchi and Skanning do not expressly disclose using a PostScript function interface to generate the functionality information. Webb teaches a method and system (abstract) of obtaining functionality information from a printer (col. 1, line 1 – col. 7, line 35; col. 24, lines 1-15) via a PostScript interface<sup>4</sup> (col. 12, lines 5-10). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have added Webb in order to operate with legacy drivers (col. 8, lines 35-45).

12. Claims 10, 11, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asauchi and Skanning as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Lozano et al. (7,168,003).

13. Asauchi and Skanning do not expressly disclose that web pages utilize the HTML format nor do they expressly disclose that printer functionality information comprises data in an XML format. Lozano teaches a method and system (abstract) of remotely maintaining printers (col. 1, line 1 – col. 4, line 20; col. 12, lines 30-50), wherein communications are used as described in an HTML format (col. 4, line 20 – col. 6, line 50) and XML format (col. 10, line 25 – col. 12, line 30 and Appendix A). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have added these features to improve analysis-updating methods (col. 4, lines 55-65).

### *Conclusion*

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. They regard further teachings on remote diagnosis.

Art Unit: 2145

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melvin H. Pollack whose telephone number is (571) 272-3887. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Melvin H Pollack  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2145

MHP  
15 June 2007

